APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,388	06/20/2003	Daniel M. Wong	OI7011293001	8538

23639   7590   07/02/2007
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER
JACKSON, JENISE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/600,388	WONG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jenise E. Jackson	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 December 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-12,14-19,21 and 26-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-12,14-19,21 and 26-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date __.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14-19, 26-31, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Bernstein et al(5,884,316).

3.   As per claims 1, 26, Bernstein et al discloses establishing a session on behalf of a

user(see col. 4, lines 33-40, 59-67); receiving a request to enable database privileges for the

user(see col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-36); verifying trusted security logic has been

executed prior to receiving the request to enable database privileges, wherein the act of verifying

the trusted security logic includes verifying a proxy user; and enabling database privileges for the

user if the trusted security logic has been executed prior to receiving the request to enable the

database privileges(see col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-36).

4.   As per claims 2, 15, 27, Bernstein discloses storing call information in one or more

frames of a call stack(see fig. 3 sheet 4); and wherein the act of verifying includes determining

whether the one or more frames of the call stack corresponds to the trusted security logic(see col.

4, lines 40-50).

5.   As per claims 3, 16, 28, Bernstein discloses wherein the act of verifying the trusted

security logic comprises verifying an application name(see col. 5, lines 1-26).

6.   As per claims 4, 17, 29, Bernstein discloses wherein the act of verifying the trusted

security logic further includes verifying a security function name(see col. 6, lines 24-36).

7.   As per claims 5, 18, 30, Bernstein discloses wherein the act of verifying trusted security

logic comprises verifying a module name(see col. 6, lines 24-36).

8.   As per claims 6, 19, 31, Bernstein discloses collecting one or more session parameters;

comparing the one or more session parameters against a set of trusted security parameters

defined in a security function; and returning a result indicating whether the one or more session

parameters matches the set of trusted security parameters(see col. 6, lines 36-50, 62-67).

9.   As per claim 9, Bernstein discloses a client-server computer system(see fig. 1 sheet 1,

col. 3, lines 21-23), a computer including: a processor(see col. 3, lines 25-26), a main memory

communicatively coupled to the processor(see col. 3, lines 25-30); and a disk storage

communicatively coupled to the processor; a database running on the computer from the main

memory(see col. 3, lines 45-67, col. 5, lines 50-55), the database further including: one or more

data structures stored in the disk storage, and a call stack stored in the main memory(see col. 5,

lines 1-22); an application program coupled to the database and configured to support a user; and

a metadata repository embodied in the one or more data structures stored in the disk storage, the

metadata repository comprising trusted security logic; wherein the application program is

configured to initiate a call to enable database privileges(see col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-

36), the call causing call information to be stored in one or more frames of the call stack and one

or more security functions to be executed; and wherein the database is configured to: verify the

call stack comprises one or more frames corresponding to the trusted security logic; test a proxy

user; and enable database privileges for the user if the trusted security logic is contained in the

one or more frames of the call stack(see col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-36).

10.   As per claim 10, Bernstein discloses wherein the application program resides with the database in the computer(see col. 5, lines 50-55).

11.   As per claim 11, Bernstein discloses wherein the application program resides on a separate computer communicatively coupled to the database(see col. 5, lines 50-63).

12.   As per claim 12, Bernstein discloses wherein the trusted security logic includes a schema name and a security package name(see col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-49).

13.   As per claim 14, Bernstein discloses have stored therein one or more sequences of instructions for enabling privileges(see col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-36), the one or more sequences of instructions causing one or more processors to perform a number of acts, said acts including establishing a session on behalf of a user(see col. 4, lines 33-40, 59-67); receiving a request to enable database privileges for the user; verifying trusted security logic has been executed prior to receiving the request to enable database privileges, wherein the act of verifying the trusted security logic includes verifying a proxy user; and enabling database privileges for the user if the trusted security logic has been executed prior to receiving the request to enable the database privileges(see col. 2, lines 50-67, col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 24-36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15.   Claims 8, 21, 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bernstein(5,884,316) in view of Fisher et al(6,092,189).

16.   As per claims 8, 21, 32, Bernstein does not disclose receiving information identifying the

user; prompting the user for a password; authenticating the user based on information stored in

an application program; and associating the user with a role.   As per claims 8, 21, 32, Fisher

discloses receiving information identifying the user; prompting the user for a password(see col.

15, lines 42-44); authenticating the user based on information stored in an application program;

and associating the user with a role(see col. 15, lines 45-51, col. 31, lines 30-34). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include receiving

information identifying the user, prompting the user for a password, authenticating the user

based on information stored in an application program; and associating the user with a role of

Fisher with Bernstein, because database security is maintained through the control of access to

the database tables by the DBMS. Data that is considered privileged can be protected from

access by those persons or programs that should not see it(see col. 39, lines 54-67 of Fisher).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jenise E. Jackson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3791.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Shiekh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

June 19, 2007

SYED A. ZIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER